

United States Court of Appeals

FIFTH CIRCUIT
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

LYLE W. CAYCE
CLERK

TEL. 504-310-7700
600 S. MAESTRI PLACE,
Suite 115
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

January 06, 2025

MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW:

No. 23-30826, Consolidated with 23-30916
Hines v. Stamos
USDC No. 3:23-CV-571

Enclosed is an order entered in this case.

Sincerely,

LYLE W. CAYCE, Clerk



By: _____
Dantrell L. Johnson, Deputy Clerk
504-310-7689

Mr. John B. Bellinger, III
Mr. James A. Brown
Ms. Marie Bussey-Garza
Ms. Camala Elizabeth Capodice
Ms. Elizabeth Mendell Carmody
Ms. Samantha Lee Chaifetz
Mr. Daniel J. Dunne
Ms. Mary Gately
Ms. Makala L. Graves
Mr. Jon Keith Guice
Mr. Gene Patrick Hamilton
Mr. Andrew Burns Johnson
Mr. R. Stanton Jones
Mr. Alfred Paul LeBlanc, Jr.
Mr. Daniel J. McCoy
Mr. Robert M. McKenna
Mr. Archis Ashok Parasharami
Ms. Julianna Petchak Parks
Mr. Andrew John Pincus
Mr. Kevin Scott Ranlett
Mr. Alex Benjamin Rothenberg
Mr. Dean John Sauer
Mr. Geoffrey Shaw
Mr. Michael Everett Talent
Ms. Elisabeth S. Theodore
Mr. Stephen K. Wirth

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

January 6, 2025

No. 23-30826

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

JILL HINES, *on behalf of herself & others similarly situated*; JIM HOFT, *on behalf of himself & others similarly situated*,

Plaintiffs—Appellees,

versus

ALEX STAMOS; RENEE DIRESTA; BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE
LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY; LELAND STANFORD
JUNIOR UNIVERSITY; KATE STARBIRD, *in her official and individual
capacities*; GRAPHIKA; CAMILLE FRANCOIS; ATLANTIC COUNCIL;
GRAHAM BROOKIE,

Defendants—Appellants,

CONSOLIDATED WITH

No. 23-30916

JILL HINES, *on behalf of herself and others similarly situated*; JIM HOFT,
on behalf of himself and other similarly situated,

Plaintiffs—Appellees,

versus

ASPEN INSTITUTE,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
USDC No. 3:23-CV-571

UNPUBLISHED ORDER

Before DAVIS, SOUTHWICK, and DUNCAN, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:

This appeal was filed challenging the district court’s denial of defendants’ motion to compel arbitration. On appeal the defendant’s argued that the district court failed to resolve the defendants defense that the court lacked personal jurisdiction over them which was necessary to enable the court to rule on the defendants’ motion to compel arbitration.

We agreed with the defendants and remanded this case to the district court to determine whether it had personal jurisdiction so as to be in a position to consider the motion to compel arbitration.

On remand the district court found it could not resolve the defendants’ motion without discovery and denied the defendants’ personal jurisdiction motion without prejudice but granted defendants’ permission to refile that motion after they conducted discovery.

The clerk then returned the case to our panel. That was premature, however, because the district court has not yet finally resolved whether it has personal jurisdiction over the defendants.

Accordingly, in this limited remand, we again REMAND this case to the district court to resolve finally the defendants’ motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction.

REMANDED.